# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF	AMERICA,	)	
	Plaintiff,	) ) )	Case No. CR 17-124 Milwaukee, Wisconsin
vs.		)	·
MARCUS HUTCHINS,		) ) )	July 26, 2019 11:30 a.m.
	Defendant.	)	

### TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE J.P. STADTMUELLER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

#### APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Benjamin W Proctor
Benjamin P Taibleson

United States Department of

Justice (ED-WI)

Justice (ED-WI)

Office of the US Attorney 517 E Wisconsin Ave - Rm 530

Milwaukee, WI 53202

414-297-4525

Fax: 414-297-1738

benjamin.proctor@usdoj.gov benjamin.taibleson@usdoj.gov

U.S. Probation Office: JAMES P. FETHERSTON (414) 297-1736

U.S. Official Reporter: JOHN T. SCHINDHELM, RMR, CRR,

Transcript Orders: www.johnschindhelm.com

Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography, transcript produced by computer aided transcription.



1 APPEARANCES CONT'D: 2 For the Defendant: Brian E Klein Baker Marquart LLP 3 777 S Figueroa St - Ste 2850 Los Angeles, CA 90012 4 424-652-7800 Fax: 424-652-7878 5 Email: bklein@bakermarquart.com 6 Marcia C Hofmann Zeitgeist Law PC 7 25 Taylor St San Francisco, CA 94102 8 415-830-6664 Email: marcia@zeitgeist.law 9 Emily Stierwalt 10 Baker Marquart LLP 777 S Figueroa St - Ste 2850 11 Los Angeles, CA 90017 424-652-7800 12 Fax: 424-652-7850 estierwalt@bakermarquart.com 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

# PROCEEDINGS

2

# 3

5

4

6

11:29

7

8 9

10 11:29

11

12 13

14

15 11:29

16

17 18

19

20 11:29

> 22 23

21

24

25 11:30

# (Call to Order of the Court at 11:28 a.m.)

THE CLERK: The Court calls the United States of America vs. Marcus Hutchins, Case No. 17-CR-124, for a sentencing hearing. May I have the appearances beginning with the Government?

MR. PROCTOR: Good morning, Your Honor. Benjamin Proctor and Benjamin Taibleson appearing for the United States.

PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor. Fetherston from Probation.

MR. KLEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Brian Klein on behalf of Marcus Hutchins.

MS. HOFMANN: Marsha Hofmann on behalf of Marcus Hutchins.

MS. STIERWALT: Emily Stierwalt on behalf of Marcus Hutchins.

MR. KLEIN: And Mr. Hutchins is here, out of custody. THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning, counsel, and good morning to Mr. Hutchins, and good morning to our probation officer.

Marcus Hutchins, back on May 2nd of this year, you entered pleas of quilty and were later adjudged quilty of two of the offenses charged in the ten-count indictment pending against you, that being the superseding indictment.

The offense charged in Count 1 constitutes a violation

of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 371; the offense charged in Count 2 constitutes a violation of Title 18 U.S.C.

\$ 2512(1)(c)(i), and 2.

We have now reached that stage of these proceedings

We have now reached that stage of these proceedings where it becomes the duty of the Court to address several questions to both you and counsel. First of all, Mr. Hutchins, have you had sufficient opportunity to review the revised presentence report prepared in your case under date of July 23rd of this year, as well as the addendum to that report which bears the same date, July 23rd?

THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Similarly, counsel for the defendant, Mr. Klein and your colleagues, have you had an opportunity to review those documents?

MR. KLEIN: We have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And are there any facts disclosed in the numbered paragraphs that either you or your client take issue with or otherwise seek clarification on?

MR. KLEIN: There is one minor one, Your Honor. And I would turn your attention to paragraph 147 of the revised PSR. It's on page 28.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KLEIN: I believe under the new calculation by the Probation Office in the report, Mr. Hutchins is now in Zone B

11:31 10

12 13

11

5

6

7

8

9

11:30

14

11:31 15

16

17

18

19

20

11:31

21

22

22

23

24

11:31 25

and he actually would be eligible for probation. So I believe this should be changed to say he is eligible for probation now.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Fetherston?

PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. KLEIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Proctor, Mr. Taibleson, any objection either as to the facts or information in the revised presentence report?

MR. PROCTOR: Not with regard to the facts, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

That being the case and the Court having no independent basis to challenge or otherwise disagree with any of the facts or finding them to be lacking, the Court does herewith adopt all of the facts as detailed in the numbered paragraphs of the July 23rd revised presentence report, which now takes us to the matter of the advisory sentencing guidelines applicable in Mr. Hutchins' case.

As we are aware, the Probation Department has submitted the following metric: It includes a total offense level of 11, criminal history category I which, in combination with the offense level, carries a guideline term of imprisonment of 8 to 14 months, followed by a term of at least 1 but not more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

11:32

11:32

11:32

11:33

1

3

4

11:34 5

7

6

8

11:34 10

11

13

14

12

11:34 15

17

16

18

19 11:35 20

2122

2324

11:35 25

than 3 years of supervised release, a fine of not less than \$4,000, nor no more than \$40,000, and, finally, a \$100 special assessment on each count or a total special assessment of \$200.

Mr. Klein, do you and your client and your colleagues accept that guideline metric as recommended by the Probation Department?

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Proctor and Mr. Taibleson,
I appreciate you submitted objections to the guideline
submission which are addressed in the July 23rd addendum. Based
on the Probation Department's analysis, do you wish to be heard
further on the objections or do you accept the Probation
Department's calculations?

MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, since we have submitted a lot of paper on this, I do want to just briefly address this issue.

Our issue is with the calculation that results in no assessment based on loss under 2B1.1. And ultimately if the Court wants to take this under 3553(a), I understand, but I do want to just emphasize what the government's position is on that.

There's really no argument here that the malware was not deployed and that people were not harmed. The argument is that the government isn't able to identify specific individuals who suffered due to the deployment of the malware.

And that's largely due here to the nature of the offense and the defendant's actions. There's a decentralized aspect to this where the malware was sold to individuals, it could be customized to them, and there was no real centralized command and control infrastructure to go on. It was distributed around the world.

Further, the sales were conducted via encrypted communications, personal messages. Malware was designed to run undetected. They were sold -- these items were sold using aliases, hiding the anonymity of the internet. And there are marketplaces where information that can be harvested using this malware is then resold, which further adds layers in trying to tie the specific items to the defendant's conduct.

So I submit that loss exists, but it's very difficult to pin down in this case; therefore, we opted for a "gains theory" as permitted under 2B1.1. And to that end, we tried to seek out sales records from the data that was available to us.

Two points on that. One, we scraped the data from
Liberty Reserve databases, which is where and how the FBI had
purchased UPAS from the defendant and his accomplice, and that's
where the money went. So we know that that account was used in
connection with the offense.

And we also used comments in the advertisements for Kronos where commenters would say, hey, I purchased this, this aspect isn't working, and Mr. Hutchins' accomplice would

11:35

11:36

11:36

response, you know, and somebody saying, okay, you know, it will be fixed. Things like that that indicate purchases.

3

3

4

11:37

6

5

7

9

11:37 10

11

12 13

14

11:38 15

16

17

18 19

11:38 20

21 22

23

24

11:38 25

Now, in the -- in the PSR and in the addendum, the -- and in the objection, the defendant objected to the Liberty Reserve numbers. There wasn't a specific objection to the comments numbers, the numbers that we developed from the comments section which showed 13 separate sales of Kronos. And we knew the price of that based on what was advertised and what the government had purchased it for, which is in the 2,000 to \$3,000 range.

So I stand by our numbers that we've submitted, which I believe allows the Court to make a reasonable estimate of gains in this case based on the conduct of the defendant and his accomplice in selling the malware and we -- that's between 47 and \$60,000. But even if we get rid of the Liberty Reserve money that the defendant has objected to, we still are left with about \$26,000, if we base it on 13 sales at \$2,000 per sale, which still would give a -- an adjustment of four levels.

So, again, the government isn't ultimately recommending a specific sentence here. If the Court wants to take this all under 3553(a), I understand, but that's the government's position.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Do counsel for Mr. Hutchins have anything more you'd

1

3

4

5

6

11:39

7

9

10

8

11

11:39

12

13

14

15 11:39

> 16 17

18

19

20 11:40

21

23

22

24

25 11:40

like to add beyond your submissions to the Probation Department? MS. HOFMANN: Your Honor, I would just like to briefly respond to the government's points just now.

It's the government's burden to prove pecuniary loss by a preponderance of the evidence. And the probation office has reviewed the evidence presented here by the government before, and we agree with the probation office that this evidence is just too speculative to establish any sort of reasonable estimate of loss here.

We agree that there was some form of loss, but it's impossible to quantify. And the Liberty Reserve data simply is a selection of transactions that are not clearly tied to any particular activity that the government is guessing had to do with sales of UPAS.

We simply agree with the probation office. We think that there is some loss here. Certainly Mr. Hutchins and his co-conspirator had some kind of gain, but we don't know what it is, and we think that it simply doesn't justify an adjustment for sentencing purposes.

> THE COURT: All right. Anything further, Mr. Proctor? MR. PROCTOR: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, fortunately, at least in this branch of the court, this is only the second of these computer-related cases that I've had before me. And fortunately, or unfortunately, the last one was almost a generation ago - Chad

Davis, 99-CR-183. And Mr. Proctor's colleagues, Mr. Eric Klumb, and I forget who the other assistant was, made similar arguments because of an intrusion on a Department of Defense server. And there was some hard loss. As I recall it was 7 or \$8,000, much less than what the government was seeking at sentencing.

11:41

11:41

11:42

11:42

11:43

And in Mr. Davis's case the guidelines, as I recall, keeping in mind they were mandatory back then, called for a sentence of 6 to 10 months. And Mr. Davis, like Mr. Hutchins, was, in the vernacular, what might be best described as a youthful offender, but the conduct was a felony.

years ago, that the real issue, and it's still prevalent in today's world, and that is the matter of cybersecurity is an incredibly challenging issue, even in today's world. And the protocols that are in place, as we know from both this set of facts and the WannaCry debacle, that the protocols are really woefully, woefully inadequate. And we live in a world today where security is everything, whether it's in finance, whether it's in healthcare, whether it's in transportation, whether it's in law enforcement, manufacturing, I mean, the list goes on and on.

And obviously there's a body of talent out there in the face and name of Marcus Hutchins who can be drawn upon to bring this matter of cybersecurity within our reach so that we don't see these cases, even though, generationally, different years, different faces.

11:43

11:44

11:45

11:45

And so when it comes to the whole matter of loss or gain, I think the thing that's most striking is the comparison between UPAS and Kronos and WannaCry. Because if one looks at the loss and the number of infections — not hits, infections — over 8 billion throughout the world with WannaCry and over 120 million alone with the UK. And thankfully, because of Mr. Hutchins' foresight and ability to put in place in a matter of hours a kill switch, it makes — the facts of the case that is before the Court today virtually pale in comparison. And we need to keep in focus not only the sentencing guidelines, but the societal interest as a whole in determining what ought to be an appropriate, fair, just and reasonable sentence.

I dare say, had this case been prosecuted and the WannaCry issue come up six months after Mr. Hutchins was formally processed here in this district, this morning, soon to be this afternoon, we'd be looking at a motion pursuant to U.S. Sentencing Guideline 5K1.1 for a downward departure.

And the facts of this case are such, quite candidly, that this investigation began two or three years before Mr. Hutchins was actually arrested. And obviously law enforcement was totally unaware, because WannaCry hadn't even been released much less kill-switched before Mr. Hutchins was brought before the bar of justice.

So the Court has these overarching considerations, not

11:46 25

only the matter of the loss versus infections, versus hits, versus the hard reality that there's a lot more to not only the facts that underlie this case, but the facts that are associated with the individual who is before the Court today for sentencing.

11:46

11:46

11:47

11:47

11:48

And so I have no doubt, absolutely none, having spent over 16 years of my career as an assistant U.S. attorney and the U.S. attorney in this district, that the government coming before the Court today with no recommendation on sentencing is very thoughtful, but it telegraphs to the Court that they put themselves in a corner by putting pedal to the metal for over two years in litigating this case that perhaps in the bigger picture with another set of facts and circumstances undifferentiated from those that are before the Court, that this case could have been resolved at least a year, 15 months ago, but, unfortunately, it wasn't.

I appreciate the government is entitled to pursue the case as it deems appropriate, but we're now beyond that point.

But the Court is still left with having to make the value judgment on what the totality of the facts and circumstances presented in terms of what is most appropriate that is fair, just and reasonable in terms of sentencing.

And with all due respect to the matter of loss and the matter of gain, I believe, at the end of the process, the Probation Department got it right in their original submission,

and that is the revised presentence report, and they also got it right in recommending that the government's objections on the matter of loss and gain be overruled. And that is the Court's position.

Everyone has weighed in. I haven't seen so much paper in a particular sentencing -- and I'm not critical of anyone on that matter, but we reach a point where a decision has to be made and the Court has made its. If the government believes that the matter richly deserves more attention, they can certainly appeal the Court's ruling with regard to these guidelines.

All of this in the loss amount really is driven just by how difficult these cases are, even in 2019. They were just as difficult in Mr. Chad Davis's case, as I said earlier, now almost a generation ago.

So on the guidelines that are before the Court, the Court is constrained to adopt the guidelines that the Probation Department initially submitted and reaffirmed; that is: A total offense level of 11; criminal history category I; guideline term of imprisonment of 8 to 14 months, followed by a term of at least 1 but not more than 3 years of supervised release; fine of not less than \$4,000 nor no more than \$4 million; and, finally, a \$200 special assessment.

Having made those determinations, counsel, particularly Mr. Klein and your colleagues, do any of you have

11:48

11:49

11:49 15

11:50 20

11:50 25

1

3

4

5

11:51

6 7

8

9

10

11

11:51

12 13

14

11:51 15

16

17 18

19

11:52 **20** 

22

21

23 24

11:52 25

any reason to advance, now late morning, as to why the Court ought not proceed today with the imposition of sentence in this case?

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, no. I understand we'll have a chance to make a few additional arguments to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Certainly. And the Court has reviewed the lengthy sentencing memoranda that the government prepared, that you prepared, that you've further submitted material on. And I would note, parenthetically, that many of these submissions were made under seal. And to the extent that counsel wish to draw upon them beyond what is before the Court in writing, you're either going to have to waive the sealing as to comments you make or ask that the Court seal the courtroom during those presentations that are drawn from sealed material.

So if you want to confer about that with Mr. Proctor and Mr. Taibleson, feel free, and we can prepare accordingly.

(Counsel confer.)

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, thank you for giving us that moment.

We spoke with Mr. Taibleson and Mr. Proctor, and we will waive the sealing as to our comments. There are things we would still like to be kept under seal, and we will be discrete and judicious in what we say.

THE COURT: Certainly. Well, you should appreciate I've spent a lot of time reading the materials this week and

before. And I appreciate the fact that this is the first time
that I have met your client. He's had many encounters with the
magistrates and the Court has reviewed the magistrates'
recommendations on pretrial motions and ruled on those, but I
have not personally been introduced to your client until today.

MR. KLEIN: We understand. It is somewhat of a

MR. KLEIN: We understand. It is somewhat of a strange process in that way, that you don't meet until you sentence him. He's here.

THE COURT: Certainly. To the extent, Mr. Klein and Ms. Stierwalt and Ms. Hofmann, if you'd like to address the Court individually and if Mr. Hutchins wishes to make some comments, now is your opportunity.

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I'm going to make a few short comments. We did submit a substantial amount of briefing and we appreciate your attention to it and thorough reading of it.

And so what I'd like to start with is just acknowledging some of the family and friends who are here today.

Marcus's mother and father are here from England.

Some of the friends whose letters are included in the brief. Tarah Wheeler is also here with her husband. Another friend, Tran. They've flown here to support him. We think they represent a global community of people who support Mr. Hutchins, and he will return from this to people who love and support him.

I want to address a couple points that the government

16

11:54

17 18

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

11:53

19

11:54 20

21

22

23

24

11:54 25

11:55 5

11:55

11:55 15

11:55

11:56 25

raised and I'll be as brief as I can be, Your Honor. One thing the government alludes to is that what Mr. Hutchins was doing was his job. His job was cybersecurity.

He did work for Kryptos Logic, but on that day with WannaCry he was doing more than his job. He was actually on vacation. And his job, as the head of Threatened Intelligence at Kryptos Logic, was in helping identifying malware, but not ransomware. WannaCry is ransomware.

So the companies that employed and hired Kryptos Logic were not hiring him to do what he did that day. He was running around town on vacation, heard about this, and came back and saved the world.

And I think that's an important point. Of course, if he was even doing his job, he should still be lauded. If a firefighter saves not just one building but the world from burning down, they're going to be lauded. And that's what happened that day.

A couple other points. As a foreigner, Mr. Hutchins is not eligible to some of the benefits if he was sentenced to prison that a U.S. citizen would get, including the right to be released to a halfway house or be on home detention. One of the reasons we're asking for probation, which I know Your Honor is aware of.

The government raises a bunch of points about deterrence. And I would think there is no disagreement with

1

3

4

5

11:56

6 7

8

9

10 11:56

> 11 12

> > 13

15

14

11:57

16 17

18

19

20 11:57

22

21

23 24

25 11:57

anybody here in this courtroom that Mr. Hutchins does not need specific deterrence. He is not going to commit these crimes again. He already is way past that in his life.

As for the argument of general deterrence, I would just note that is one of the many 3553(a) factors. And it's not the only one, of course and you consider it with all the other ones including his -- who he is.

I would note that he has spent two years caught up in this legal system. He accepts responsibility for his actions. He's not trying to make excuses. This process played out the way it did. But he has already suffered, frankly, somewhat greatly. He's been pulled away from his job, the thing he cares about. He's had to live in a foreign country. He's been separated from his family and friends. He will return to the UK as a felon. Now, he won't lose the benefits that a felon here would lose who is a citizen, but it will, for the rest of his life, follow him around. And so I think Your Honor should keep that in mind when you consider general deterrence.

A couple other brief points. The government's sentencing position spends seven pages talking about this crime. We don't dispute any of that. They spent one page talking about Mr. Hutchins. That should be reversed, Your Honor.

As you indicated at the start of your comments, security is everything. That is a motto that Mr. Hutchins lives by too. And I think that Your Honor is not giving that short

shrift based on your introductory remarks already.

And, just briefly, by looking at the last -- how the government chooses to end its sentencing position, which is talking about, again, focusing on deterrence. And it states on page 12 of its brief, "... but this does not permit him or anyone else to pretend his criminal conduct was insignificant."

Mr. Hutchins does not pretend it's insignificant. His life shows that. What he's done shows that. And that would not be the message he'd want anyone else to have either.

The government then goes on to say, "Like a man who spent years robbing banks, and then one day came to realize that was wrong, and even worked to design better security systems, he deserves credit for his epiphany."

We agree. "But he still bears responsibility for what he did." We don't disagree, but I would want to talk for a moment about that analogy.

Mr. Hutchins is not a bank robber. There was no violence. He was not -- he was youthful, as Your Honor indicated. That analogy is far from perfect. He was most akin to someone in his youth who created lock picks to help people rob banks. And we're not downplaying that. That's a serious crime too.

But, when you think about that, someone who creates lock picks to help people rob banks and we can't identify what banks they robbed or if they got any money or -- we know there

11:58 10

11 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11:58

13

14

11:58 15

16

17 18

19

11:59 20

21

22

23 24

11:59 25

1 were more than 10, we don't dispute that, but when they say and 2 then worked to design a better security system, that's not what 3 Mr. Hutchins did. He didn't work just to design a better 4 security system, he worked to stop bank robberies. And he 5 stopped a lot of bank robberies, Your Honor. I think you know 11:59 6 that from our briefing. And I think when you focus on that for 7 a moment, he stopped the world's biggest bank robbery. A roque 8 nation set out in May 2017 to shut down the world, and he 9 stopped it. He deserves credit for that, and I think Your Honor 10 is giving him credit for that. 12:00 11 It's been a real privilege to represent him. And with 12 that, I'm done. 13 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Do your colleagues 14 wish to add any comments, Mr. Klein? MR. KLEIN: No, Your Honor. I think Mr. Hutchins has 15 12:00 16 a statement if this is the time. 17 THE COURT: Certainly. 18 MS. HOFMANN: Your Honor, I have a copy of it if you 19 would like to follow along. May I approach? 20 12:00 THE COURT: Certainly. 21 (Brief pause.) 22 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, when I was a teenager, I 23 made a series of bad decisions which led me to being involved in 24 writing and selling malware over a period of some years.

I deeply regret my conduct, the crimes in which I was

25

involved, and the harm which resulted from the code I had written. I eventually discontinued my involvement in creating malware, but I wish I could go back and undo all the damage I had caused.

I now work in cybersecurity, focusing mostly on tracking and stopping the same kinds of malware that I was once involved in. As a hobby, I also liked to create educational content, teaching people about malware in the context of detecting and preventing it. I do this in the hope that I can steer people away from the path in which I once took, even before people knew of my mistakes.

Throughout the process of this case, I have not only had to face my past, but reflect on the harm caused by the malware I once developed, some which I was not even aware of. The future reinforces that I have no intention to go back to that life. My plan is to continue my work in security, but if possible I would like to dedicate more time to teaching the next generation of security experts.

Finally, I'd like to apologize to the victims of the malware I developed, the colleagues and acquaintances who felt betrayed upon learning of my past, my friends, and most importantly my family who have endured much financial and emotional stress as the result of me being arrested in a foreign country.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to this.

12:01

12:01 10

12:02 15

12:02 20

12:02 25

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hutchins.

Anyone else like to speak this afternoon on behalf of Mr. Hutchins?

MR. KLEIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Proctor, Mr. Taibleson, do you have some thoughts you'd like to add?

MR. PROCTOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

We do have a unique case here, Your Honor. We have a serious offense, and we also have some very unique positive attributes associated with the defendant. WannaCry was a big deal. No doubt about it. And I'll talk a little bit more about that in a bit. But I want to talk about why the government considers this offense particularly serious.

The development of malware can be a lucrative and prestigious business for those who want to get into it and then they feel safe hiding around the world through the anonymity of the internet. And these are crimes that affect everyone, either through personal victimization, or through increased costs associated with remedying the victimization of others, or through dedication of more resources continually toward cybersecurity.

Now, the banking trojans that Mr. Hutchins created had one purpose, and that was to make it easy for others to steal personal information, specifically banking credentials, which

12:04

12:03

12:03

12:03

can be used to steal identities and drain life savings.

Malware is designed to secretly record all the keystrokes on the victim's computer, steal log-in credentials, for any type of business, email, social media accounts, and basically allow a takeover of the victim's computer.

Now, the parties agree that this malware, particularly Kronos, was used to infect computers around the world and this is further shown through some of the reports and studies included in our memo.

Reports of Kronos infections go back to 2014, the year that Mr. Hutchins and an accomplice were first observed selling that product, advertising it. They continued through 2015 and 2016. And Mr. Hutchins bears some responsibility for the fallout associated with this malware, and I appreciate his comments today where he does take such responsibility.

I know in the defendant's submissions to the Court, they take issue with some of the facts and figures showing the impact that Kronos has had in terms of how many alerts have been raised. The government's numbers on that are sound. We're not pulling them from the wind. They come from leading cybersecurity firms who implement protocols to limit false positives which are just a reality of this type of research. And that data is relied on with confidence by researchers, businesses and governments in assessing cybersecurity threats.

Moreover, just because an alert may reflect an

12:04

12:04

12:05

interception of Kronos, that doesn't mean there can be no infection as argued by the defendant. Successful interceptions require the most up-to-date cybersecurity protections, and that's hardly uniform across all computer users. Indeed that malware is only effective if it actually infects computers. Attackers, therefore, get their product tested and altered through crypting in order to beat back these type of protections.

12:06

12:07

12:07

12:07

12:08

Now, our data shows that there have been over 200 variants of Kronos spanning from 2014 to 2019. And one way that those variants are created is through crypting, as I mentioned, and that was a service offered by the defendant and his accomplice. And each of those variants can impact countless computers.

In the end, what the data shows is that attackers have been using and continue to use the products developed by Mr. Hutchins to steal information from victim computers. Now, was it the most prolific thing out there? No. But it's maintained a constant presence since 2014, activity rising and falling at times, affecting all sectors of the economy, in the U.S. and in other countries.

Now, switching gears a bit to the defendant himself.

We agree with the defense that there are many, many positive attributes for the Court to consider. We agree that

Mr. Hutchins was young when he committed this offense. Though,

this isn't an excuse, he did know right from wrong, and he continued his criminal conduct for several years. But, it's not uncommon for young people to make a poor decision and then come to realize it later and make different decisions.

That's here. Mr. Hutchins has generally -- genuinely left his criminal path behind him. And I've read the many letters submitted by the defense, from Mr. Hutchins' friends, his family, his coworkers and acquaintances. They're very moving letters and they do show the positive impact he's had on many lives.

And again, his role in stopping WannaCry, it was a major event. He rightly deserves the credit and notoriety he's received for helping to stop what was on track to be an unbelievable cyber disaster.

And he's accepted responsibility, he's entered a guilty plea, and he's expressed remorse for his criminal conduct. All of that is to his credit.

Your Honor, in the end we have a serious offense, one in which the defendant tried to make money for himself, making it easy for other people to victimize and steal information from others. He knew what he was doing. He did it without concern for the lives that would be ruined. And once that genie came out of the bottle, it can't be put back in. It's still out there. Variations of it are still being used today. And, on the other hand, we have a very unique individual with very

12:08

12:08

12:08

12:09 20

12:09 25

significant positive contributions to our society. And per the terms of the plea agreement, we aren't recommending a specific sentence. We defer to the judgment of Your Honor in balancing all these factors.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Proctor.

Anything further that the defense would like to either comment on or submit?

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we addressed our response in all our briefing. I don't think we have anything else to say. I think we've thoroughly addressed all those issues and our feelings on the government's loss numbers and claim number of victims beyond 10.

Unless you have specific questions of us about that, I think we've addressed those.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Well, Mr. Hutchins, the judge that you are before today recently passed his 32nd anniversary as an Article III district judge. You're pretty close to being number 2200 of the defendants that I have sentenced over the last 32 years. Each and every case is different, and your case is just as unique as most unique cases that come before the Court. And, frankly, all of that makes the job that His Honor has so interesting, because we see all sides of the human existence, both young, old, career criminals, those like yourself who may have strayed from what we

12:09

12:10

12:10

would expect not only in your homeland in England, but here in these United States.

And I appreciate the fact that one might view the ignoble conduct that underlies this case as against the backdrop of what some have described as the work of a hero, a true hero. And that is, at the end of the day, what gives this case in particular its incredible uniqueness.

It is very difficult, even in the context of sentencing guidelines, to begin to put together a mosaic that would ultimately lead to what has been described in the submissions as a fair, just, and reasonable sentence that is one that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing.

And there are many, many facets, not only of you and your personality, but many facets of the core conduct of this case versus what occurred with the matter of WannaCry.

And then there is the other ingredient that not a lot of attention has been spent on because it's one of those unquantifiables, other than the core fact, and that is, you have been away from your family and your homeland for over two years. And there's something to be said for basically being, for lack of a better description, caught up in the legal morass that attends a very, very complicated set of facts and circumstances that have international, indeed global implications.

And while this case may have taken a different

12:14 25

12:12

12:12

12:12

trajectory with different hands at the tiller as it were early on, we then can't regenerate the course of what occurred once this case was submitted and filed. Just like the return of the superseding indictment. These are matters over which the Court has no direct control except that there are consequences that flow from them, both for the government as well as the defense. And I am not sure, from even a review of the plea agreement or of the history of this case, precisely what it was that lead to your decision to resolve the case in the manner in which it's been resolved.

12:14

12:15

12:15

12:15

12:16

To be sure, again, against the backdrop of more than

16 years as a prosecutor, it is fair, reasonable and

appropriate, and we're now at the final chapter of what ought to

be the ultimate disposition.

And as everyone associated with this case is so well aware, and as so well aware is the judge, this case has a series of complex interfaces that require a bit of distillation, particularly against the backdrop of the 3553(a)(2) factors that the Court must draw upon in imposing an appropriate sentence. Because, unlike Mr. Chad Davis, the guidelines in this case, whatever they be, whether they be the government's suggestion of more than 20-month sentence or those that the Court has adopted from the Probation Department, they're advisory. They are not mandatory. Just like there is no mandatory minimum sentence associated with this case.

Perhaps in the context of WannaCry, if you were the defendant in the WannaCry case with over 8 billion infections and humongous losses, there perhaps should be a minimum mandatory sentence. But the reality is, those that are perpetrating these massive intrusions as they have been described, are not typically anywhere near these United States given the reality that the internet is accessible worldwide.

12:16

12:17

12:17

12:18

12:18

And then you add all of the layers of the deep down under in which these communications and malware and ransomware are launched, it's very, very difficult for law enforcement to access them until such time as the effects are widespread and known.

And more here in these United States, there have been millions of individuals whose credit ratings have been affected as a result of hacking of systems, whether it be at Target or other retailers or credit card providers, et cetera, et cetera. And it's going to take individuals like yourself who have the skillset, even at the tender age of 24 or 25, to come up with solutions, because that is the only way we are going to eliminate this entire subject of, as the Court described it earlier, the woefully inadequate security protocols that are in place for our entire panoply of information technology systems. Whether it's individual computers or servers or networks or websites, they're all caught up in the same milieu of inadequate security.

And it is very much like our individual security.

Keeping in mind whether it's Judge Stadtmueller leaving the courthouse, we are not cloaked with or embosomed in security that we are not subject to whether it's being assaulted or shot at or what have you.

These instrumentalities, although we are talking about cybersecurity, are prevalent in so much of everyday life that we endure as a society. And it only occurs the right way when well-intentioned people respect the rights of others. Whether it's their personal security, whether it's their financial security, whether it is their computer security, their home security, their children's security, the list just goes on and on and on.

And so you can begin to appreciate in the parlance of sentencing just how serious this sort of conduct if fully implemented can be because it's so devastating and it's uncontrollable particularly when you don't know where it is coming from. That is the real conundrum when it comes to security. We know there's a potential, but until you know where it is coming from it is very, very difficult to intercept and take remedial action.

There's also the component of deterrence. And this has been discussed extensively throughout, as well as respect for the law. I quite agree with your approach and that of your counsel that this is not a matter that ought to be of primary

12:21 **25** 

12:19

12:19

12:20

concern of this court, because you turned the corner, if you will, before being arrested in connection with the matter before the Court. I appreciate the investigation started years before. But in terms of your actual appearance before the bar of justice, it occurred after you turned the corner.

Now, on the one hand that makes you a hero. On the other hand, it doesn't totally wipe out the ignobility of the conduct that serves as the predicate for the Court's sentence today. But it's certainly to your credit that, without any encouragement, working for an FBI agent or security in England that you stepped up to the plate without any expectation either of notoriety or consideration for potential charges stemming from UPAS or Kronos. So all that is to your credit.

Just as it is important for the Court to keep in mind the relative age and the relative culpability, if you will, of a young person who may not have matured to the point of being able, at the end of the day, to exercise what parents would say, good judgment. Good judgment is everything. And without good judgment you could be 140 IQ and have all the requisite talent to do great things. But commensurate with all of the ability to do those great things, as has been exhibited in this case, is the ability to, along the way, to acquire that most important of traits, and that is the exercise of good judgment.

There is no question, in looking at you and your background, that in a very, very poignant way you have chosen to

12:21

12:22 10

12:22 15

12:23

12:23 25

be more of an introvert as opposed to extrovert. And you have been very circumspect in selecting friends who for the most part are on the same page as Marcus Hutchins, that is, wanting to do the right thing at all times and be guided by a set of principles and morals that keep you on the straight and narrow such that you would never find yourself in front of a court, particularly in the context of being a defendant in a criminal prosecution.

So all of that, too, weighs very considerably in the Court's determination today as to what the ultimate sentence ought to be.

Yes, there is the matter of deterrence. It's important generally. Because, as we all know, and why it is that it is so incredibly important that as a society we continue to aggressively deal with cybersecurity issues because it has become such an integral part of our society. And if we don't take the appropriate steps to protect the security of these wonderful technologies that we rely upon each and every day, it has all the potential, as your parents know from your mom's work, to raise incredible havoc in the workplace, whether it's hospital care, whether it's transportation systems, whether it's the matter of manufacturing or financial or just communication generally. Just think about what we would be doing today if we didn't have computers or cell phones or tablets. It has totally eclipsed the way of life, whether it's here in these United

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

12:24

12:24

12:25

States or the world.

12:26

12:27

12:27

So, all of those components are very much part and parcel of the Court's analysis this afternoon as to reaching this question of ultimately what ought to be a fair, just and reasonable sentence.

There is no question that for you personally, had you become aware of the work that might be available to you, whether here in the United States or England with a firm such as Kryptos Logic, you may never have ventured into what brings all of us to this courtroom today.

Keeping in mind, there is no limit, as we know from many, many who have labored long and hard in technology, that putting the effort into that which brings positive results carries with it not only the adulation of being recognized, but the rewards that far transcend the matter of adulation or financial success.

And you have all of those potentials in a very, very unique way. Whether you will be able to exercise any of that in the future back in these United States, I guess is a bit of an open question given the fact that the sentence that the Court imposes today may, at the end of the day, preclude your coming back to the United States in the absence of either a waiver because of your unique skillset, or potentially a pardon for the conduct that underlies the case.

And while the Court has no pardon power, that is a

12:28 **20 21** 

12:28 25

matter that is reserved to the Executive Branch of government. And what the protocols are for that, given the totality of the facts and circumstances in this case, is truly left for another day, another person, another administrative body within the U.S. Department of Justice and the Executive Branch to make the value judgment call on. But it's certainly something that ought not go unnoticed, particularly against the backdrop of what occurred and your efforts with regard to WannaCry and what might lie ahead in terms of your future abilities, whether back in England or worldwide, to deal with the nettlesome issues that the Court has addressed more than once today.

12:29

12:29

12:30

12:30

12:31

In terms of protecting the public from other criminal conduct, again, I hearken back to what is already self-evident in the old adage of that which is obvious need not necessarily be restated, but it's certainly worth emphasizing that Marcus Hutchins turned the corner with regard to any further conduct that would be remotely connected to what led to the charges in this case ever occurring again. There are just too many positives on the other side of the ledger, whether they be academic, whether they be financial, whether they be rewards of a wholly different type, but they're all there.

So we reach a point in balancing all of these considerations and, at the end of the process, the Court is left to make the final call as to what ought to be an appropriate sentence.

1

3

4

12:31 5

7

9

6

12:32 10

11 12

13

14

12:32 15

16

17 18

19

12:34 20

22

21

23

24

12:35 **25** 

And the final call in the case of Marcus Hutchins today is a sentence of time served, with a one-year period of supervised release.

I don't know whether the supervised release in this case is ultimately going to be viewed as academic because we don't know, as of Friday, July 26, 2019, what lies ahead in terms of Mr. Hutchins' ability to continue to reside or work in the United States. But in order to ensure that there be some follow-on with regard to supervision, my staff have prepared a series of 14 conditions of supervised release and I'm going to circulate those to counsel. And if you would be so kind, Mr. Klein and Ms. Hofmann, to review those with your client, and suggest any changes from either you or the government.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Brief pause.)

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we've reviewed the conditions -- proposed conditions. We just have two small comments?

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. KLEIN: Nos. 12 and 13. Mr. Hutchins plans to return home. I assume that's contemplated in that type of instruction. He just needs to tell his probation officer he's going to fly home.

THE COURT: Certainly. There is nothing further after today that requires that he stay here. There may be an issue

getting his passport back so he can depart and be allowed back into England.

MR. KLEIN: And then no. 13, Your Honor, he doesn't have plans for that, but I just think it should be clear that it's limited to the United States. He'll be back in England. Idon't know what's going to happen and he has no plans, but I think it should be clear that it's U.S. law enforcement.

THE COURT: Certainly. That's certainly agreeable with the Court.

Mr. Proctor?

MR. PROCTOR: No objections, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Fetherston, can you advise everyone what the process will be to allow Mr. Hutchins to leave and how soon?

PROBATION OFFICER: At this point, Your Honor, I would recommend that the supervised release be allowed to commence in the Central District of California. That'll allow the defendant to return there. At that point he can seek to have his passport returned to him from the Pretrial Services office. He may already be in possession of it today in order to have traveled here. At that point, it's up to him when he makes arrangements for travel. His supervision time will continue to run until it expires in one year from today's date.

THE COURT: Mr. Klein, do you have any thought on what the timeline may be to depart?

12:35

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12 13

14

12:35 15

16 17

18

19

12:36 20

21

2223

24

12:36 25

MR. KLEIN: I know he wants to return back to Los
Angeles and get his stuff in order and return home. I don't
know how quickly he'll be able to do that, but he does plan to
return home relatively quickly.

THE COURT: All right. Well, the judgment and commitment order will reflect that the Court will designate the Central District of California as to the place that he is to report.

Obviously given today is a Friday, the earliest would be on Monday. Mr. Fetherston can notify his counterparts in Los Angeles of the sentence that the Court has imposed today. I'm not sure whether it will be processed fully today. I'm certain that the court will get it out on Monday morning. And once they receive it and if he notifies them that he is going to make arrangements to return to England, he'll have to be processed there because he will be subject to their jurisdiction as long as he remains in the U.S. There's nothing about the Court's judgment or sentence that require that he remain in the United States.

And what I'm seeking to avoid is that he be allowed to return on his own and not be taken into custody by Immigration and Customs.

MR. KLEIN: His plan is to return on his own, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: No, I understand that's what he would

12:38 25

12:36

12:37

12:37

another statistic. That's my point.

3

4

5

6

MR. KLEIN: We appreciate that, Your Honor.

12:38

THE COURT: So for all of the reasons that the Court

has discussed with the input of counsel, this now becomes the

like, but we don't need any more publicity about this and having

formal sentence of the Court:

7

8 9

10 12:39

11

12

13 14

15 12:39

> 16 17

18 19

20 12:40

22

21

23

24

25 12:40

Marcus Hutchins, on May 2nd of this year you entered a plea of guilty and were adjudged guilty both as to Counts 1 and 2 of the underlying superseding indictment, Count 1 charging a violation of Title 18 § 371, and Count 2 charging a violation of Title 18 § 2512(c)(i), and 2.

The Court having asked the defendant why judgment should not now be pronounced and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that you, Marcus Hutchins, be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a period of time served as to each of Counts 1 and 2, to operate to run concurrent with one another for a total sentence of time served.

The Court further determines that the defendant does not have the financial ability to pay any fine and accordingly waives any fine in his case.

Upon release from imprisonment he shall be placed on supervised release for a term of one year, subject to each of the 14 conditions, two of which were modified, until such time as he departs from the United States.

He will be released to the Central District of California where he is to report on Monday, July 29th to that office to receive further instructions, as well as disclose his travel plans to return to his native country.

In accordance with the terms of the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act of 1996, as provided for in 18 U.S.C. § 3013, the Court is obliged to impose a special assessment in the amount of \$100 as to each count of conviction for a total special assessment of \$200, which is due and payable immediately at the Office of the Clerk of the Court, which is located in Room 362 of this building.

In addition, pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement the offenses charged in Counts 3 through 10 inclusive of the superseding indictment will stand dismissed.

Having entered pleas of guilty to the conduct charged in Counts 1 and 2 of the superseding indictment, and the Court having imposed today what it believed to be an appropriate, fair, just and reasonable sentence that is one that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing, I now advise Mr. Hutchins that if he believes the guilty pleas he earlier entered were either involuntary or contrary to law, or that the Court imposed a sentence today that is contrary to law, I now advise him of his right of appeal.

Should you elect to appeal, Mr. Hutchins, Mr. Klein and Ms. Hofmann are obliged to file a notice of appeal on your

12:40

12:41 10

12:41 15

12:42 20

1

3

4

12:42 5

7

8

6

9

12:43 10

11 12

13

14

12:43 15

16

17 18

19

12:43 20

21

22

23

24

12:43 25

behalf within 14 days of the docketing of the judgment and commitment order, otherwise you will have effectively waived any right of appeal.

If you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal you do have the right to seek relief to appeal in forma pauperis.

And as you are aware, Counsel, pursuant to the teachings of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Rowe vs. Flores-Ortega* decided in February of 2000, you have an obligation to confer with your client as to the merit of any appeal and be guided by any request that he may make of you in that regard.

In the event he elects to forego any appeal, I would invite you as his counsel to formally notify the Court, whether by pleading or letter, indicating that you have discussed with your client his right of appeal and that he has elected to forego such an appeal.

In addition to the communication, whether it be a notice or a letter, I would also ask that you have your client sign that communication acknowledging having been advised of his right of appeal and that he has elected to forego such an appeal.

Are there any other matters that the Court need address, Mr. Klein or Mr. Proctor?

MR. PROCTOR: Not from the United States.

MR. KLEIN: None from the defense, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. The Court stands in recess.

# CERTIFICATE

I, JOHN T. SCHINDHELM, RMR, CRR, Official Court
Reporter for the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the foregoing
pages are a true and accurate transcription of my original
machine shorthand notes taken in the aforementioned matter to
the best of my skill and ability.

Signed and Certified August 1, 2019.

11 /s/John T. Schindhelm

John T. Schindhelm

John T. Schindhelm, RPR, RMR, CRR
United States Official Reporter
517 E Wisconsin Ave., Rm 324,
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Website: WWW.JOHNSCHINDHELM.COM